

REMARKS

Applicant has cancelled all of the originally filed claims 1-12, inclusive. New claims 13-32, inclusive, have been added to better encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention notwithstanding Applicant's belief that no claims have been narrowed within the meaning of *Festo*.

I. Rejection of Claims 2, 3, and 8-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Applicant has rewritten claims that are more distinct to overcome such rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 11 and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen

Claims 1, 3-5, 11 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Nielsen (Reference A) U.S. Patent 6,510,461. Applicant has rewritten claims that are more distinct to overcome rejection of Claims 1, 3-5, 11 and 12

Applicant intentionally shows how a highest level domain (HLD) can be used in order to further determine whether the HLD is a top level domain (TLD) or a top level domain alias (TLDA), which can be originally referenced to earlier co-pending patent application Ser. No. 09/532,500 filed March 21, 2000, by Schneider, entitled "Fictitious domain name method, product, and apparatus". There is no other known art aside from Applicant's co-pending related art that teaches how TLDA's can be incorporated as an aspect of the present invention. Applicant seeks to revise claims (see Claims 22-31) such that TLDA related subject matter remains distinguished above prior art.

III. Rejection of Claims 6-10 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by Nielsen

Claims 6-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Nielsen, in view of Nielsen (Reference B) U.S. Patent 5,907,680. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To date there remains no word processing spell checkers that include the ability to generate a hyperlink reference in correspondence with a detected spelling error. Applicant, to date, still can not find a spell correction user interface that allows a user improved spell correction techniques by providing the user with an ability to generate hyperlinks by using such a spell correction user interface (see Figs. 4b and 4c).

The only similarity between Nielsen and Applicant is that both teach how spell check services can be used based on some kind of condition. This is where the similarity ends. As will be shown,

Applicant teaches how spell check services can be improved to solve an entirely different problem in an existing environment whereas Nielsen teaches how conventional spell checking services can be further applied to work in a different environment.

Though Nielsen '680 discloses three components (client-side, server-side and collaborative) representing three unique but complementary methods of providing spelling check services to the user, each level is invoked (see Abstract) when a connection to the specified network address is unable to be established. *Applicant does not in any way rely on such a step of detecting or processing a spelling error after performing an unsuccessful resource location request.*

Though, Nielsen '680 extends known prior art techniques of processing spelling errors in a word processing environment *that under certain conditions become further applicable* to a web browser location field environment, Nielsen '680 does not teach or even suggest how new spell correction techniques can be used. For instance, similar to how alternate words are suggested in a conventional word processing spell checker, Nielsen *teaches how the same spell correction technique* can be used by suggesting alternate URLs instead of alternate words when a URL determined incapable of being used to access a network resource. Furthermore, *there would be no need for Nielsen to have even considered applying hyperlink generation because the function of a web browser location field is to locate and access network resources.*

Even if Nielsen '680 was combined with Nielsen '461, the resulting improvement might possibly be to provide a user with an improved ability to suggest alternate URLs for any URLs in a word processing document that have been determined incapable of accessing a network resource. Applicant in no way shape or form teaches or even suggests such an improvement. Reference A and Reference B are individually complete and functional in itself, so there would be no reason to use parts from or add or substitute parts to any reference. Furthermore the references themselves teach away from the suggested combination.

Applicant teaches an entirely different approach with regard to how a spelling error is processed. Please note that identifiers such as a uniform resource locator (URL) and a fully qualified domain name (FQDN) would not be determined a spelling error, because prior art shows that identifiers of such form are recognized by word processors as spelled correctly.

All claims have been rewritten to define patentably over Nielsen and other references, alone or in combination. Dependent Claims 14-21, inclusive, incorporate all the subject matter of Claim 13 and add additional subject matter, which makes them, a fortiori, independently patentable over Nielsen. Additionally, dependent Claims 23-31, inclusive, incorporate all the subject matter of Claim 22 and add additional subject matter, which makes them, a fortiori, independently patentable over Nielsen.

IV. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

V. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 13-32, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 13-32, inclusive.

VI. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



January 21, 2004

Eric Schneider

pro se Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258

University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone